



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/817,076 07/15/97 YAMAMOTO

K 05905.0027

EXAMINER

LM01/0324

FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT
& DUNNER
1300 I STREET NW
WASHINGTON DC 20005-3315

NGUYEN, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2779

DATE MAILED:

03/24/00

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/817,076

Applicant(s)
Yamamoto

Examiner
Thu Nguyen

Group Art Unit
2779



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thu Nguyen

(3) Walter Sutcliff

(2) Michael Eisenberg

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 21, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

Gove (Patent No. 5,491,510)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants explain that the claimed "physical object" does not imply a real object (such as the hand in Gove's), but rather a virtual computer generated image (such as a character in a video game) that represents an object in the real world (such as a human being, an animal, etc). Applicants propose changing the term "physical object" to "virtual object" to avoid confusion. Examiner agrees that this is a suitable change and this does help distinguish the present invention from Gove's teachings.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Nguyen Thu

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.